REMARKS

The Office Action dated October 11, 2006, and the references cited therein have been considered. Claims 1-18 are presently pending. No claims currently stand allowed. Applicants traverse the rejection of claims 1-18. Applicants agree that tablet PC's, such as ViewSonic's ViewPad 1000, were indeed known at the time of the invention. Applicants furthermore agree that Wonderware's InTouch® HMI application could run on such a system. However, the claimed invention goes beyond merely executing the supervisory control application programs on a tablet PC. The claimed invention recites that the application programs "interact with a user via a set of tablet PC interface services associated with the human-machine interface." The prior art version of InTouch® HMI application upon which the Office Action relies, while capable of running on a PC running Windows CE, did not interact with a user via a set of tablet PC interface services (e.g., electronic pen). In other words, the InTouch® HMI application operated on all devices as though the hardware platform was a stationary computer system.

Applicants submit that the prior art neither discloses nor suggests at least the expressly recited element of interaction between a user and a supervisory control application program via a set of tablet PC interface services. A *prima facie* case of obviousness requires finding each element in the combined disclosures of the prior art references. In view of the absence of the above-cited "interaction" element, Applicants submit that the claimed invention is not obvious over the prior art.

For this reason, as well as the ones provided herein below, Applicants request favorable reconsideration of the previous rejection of the pending claims. Please charge any fee deficiencies to Deposit Account No. 12-1216.

Summary of the Rejections in View of the Prior Art

Claims 1-18 are rejected as obvious under 35 U.S.C. Section 103(a) over ViewSonic (Publication # A-CD-ViewPad 1000-1, 2001) in view of Wonderware's FactorySuite InTouch User's Guide, June 2001. In summary, the Office Action asserts that it was obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate a set of supervisory industrial control application programs (e.g., Wonderware's InTouch® HMI application) into a tablet personal computer system (e.g., ViewSonic's ViewPad 1000) such that the application programs interact with a user via a set of tablet PC interface services. The Office Action, at page 3, lines 7-8 asserts that Wonderware's InTouch® application program interacts with a user via a set of tablet PC interface services associated with the tablet PC's human-machine interface. The Office Action further states that it would have been obvious to run Wonderware's InTouch® application on the ViewSonic tablet PC since Wonderware's InTouch® application is executable on the Windows CE operating system.

Applicants traverse the grounds for each and every rejection of pending claims 1-18 for at least the reasons set forth herein below. Applicants address the specific rejections in the order they arise in the Office Action.

Summary of Applicants' Claimed Invention

The recited invention is directed to a tablet personal computer system and software that, in combination, facilitate performing a variety of industrial process design, supervisory and/or data management tasks. The tablet PC includes a human-machine interface (HMI) having an integrated touch sensitive display. A wireless communication resource is provided to facilitate communications between the tablet PC and other networked components (e.g., configuration databases, runtime process databases including live data and setpoint values, etc.). Furthermore, a set of one or more supervisory control application programs are present on the tablet PC.

Importantly, the recited application programs include capabilities that exploit tablet PC interface services associated with the human-machine interface. In the illustrative example (see, FIGs. 2, 4 and 5), the tablet extensions 210 include an electronic pen/stylus that supports digital inking via the HMI. The electronic pen/stylus service is utilized by a visualization application program described by Applicants with reference to FIGs. 4 and 5. Thus, the illustrative example of the claimed invention exploits tablet PC functionality in a way that was neither disclosed nor suggested by known supervisory control applications.

The invention, as illustrated by Applicants' examples in FIGs. 4 and 5, goes beyond merely executing a supervisory control application (e.g., InTouch) on a tablet PC. The invention includes supervisory control application programs that exploit the tablet PC's unique interface service set – most notably an electronic pen/stylus service.

Summary of the Teachings of the Cited Prior Art

The ViewSonic ViewPad discloses a tablet PC that was indeed known at the time of the invention. Furthermore, a prior art version of Wonderware's InTouch® HMI application was indeed known at the time of the invention and is an example of a supervisory control application program. Applicants furthermore agree that the prior art InTouch® program was capable of running on the Windows CE platform. However, Applicants do not agree that at the time of the invention Wonderware's InTouch® application interacted with users via a set of tablet PC interface services. In fact, as noted in the Background of the application, the InTouch® application generally operated on a stationary computer. The InTouch® application did not include the capability of exploiting tablet PC HMI services

Applicants' Remarks Concerning the Specific Grounds for the Rejection

Applicants traverse the rejection of claim 1 as obvious over ViewSonic's ViewPad 1000 in view of Wonderware's Intouch® HMI application. Applicants submit that the prior art neither discloses nor suggests at least the expressly recited element of interaction between a user and a supervisory control application program via a set of tablet PC interface services. A *prima facie* case of obviousness requires finding each element in the combined disclosures of the prior art references. Therefore, Applicants submit that the claimed invention is not obvious over the prior art.

As noted previously herein above, the claimed invention goes beyond merely placing supervisory control applications on a tablet PC. The claims recite that the applications interact with tablet PC interface services such as an electronic pen/stylus. Applicants' specification identifies particular examples in FIGs. 4 and 5 where this interaction is used in a new and unique way to enhance the functionality provided by supervisory control applications.

Applicants submit that the claimed invention is neither disclosed nor suggested by the referenced prior art. The InTouch ® HMI application, prior to the present invention, was generally executed on permanent full-size monitoring stations. As such the InTouch® HMI applications, and in particular their user interfaces, were not designed to interact with tablet PC user interface services. Though one could certainly load the prior art InTouch® application onto a Windows CE based system, the prior art InTouch® HMI application did not exploit the tablet PC user interface systems such as electronic pen/stylus input as shown, by way of example, in FIGs. 4 and 5 of the present application.

The desirability of the present invention arises from the new features supported by the tablet PC-enabled applications that are provided, by way of example, with reference to FIGs. 4 and 5 of the present application. The prior art InTouch® application did not include the features described by Applicants with reference to FIGs. 4 and 5, and thus the functionality of the prior art InTouch® application is not enhanced by modifying its code to support exploitation of tablet PC interface services such as those provided by the ViewSonic tablet PC. Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that the combined teachings of ViewSonic's tablet PC and Applicant's own prior InTouch® application program would not render the claimed invention obvious.

Applicants traverse the rejection of claims 2, 3, 4, and 5 for at least the reasons recited herein above. In particular, the prior art InTouch® HMI application was not designed to exploit tablet PC's in general and electronic pens specifically. Applicants again refer to their examples described with reference to FIGs. 4 and 5 and respectfully submit that these capabilities did not exist in the prior art version of InTouch®, and thus the inventions recited in each of the dependent claims 2-5 are neither disclosed nor suggested by the combined teachings of the ViewSonic tablet PC and the prior art InTouch® application.

Applicants traverse the rejection of claims 10-12 for at least the additional reason that, notwithstanding the *capability* of the ViewSonic tablet PC hardware to take a picture, nowhere does the ViewSonic user manual disclose that the built-in camera functionality can be coupled with the electronic pen to annotate images captured by the camera. Applicants have also noted previously that the prior art InTouch® application did not support such functionality. Therefore, the invention recited in claims 10-12 is not obvious over the prior art.

Applicants traverse the rejection of claim 16. While the prior art version of InTouch® was capable of obtaining an instantaneous set of real-time information, the prior art version of InTouch® did not support a user subsequently annotating the captured information with handwritten notes.

Applicants traverse the rejection of claims 6-9, 13-15, 17 and 18 for at least the reasons set forth herein above with regard to claim 1 from which each of these claims depends.

In summary, Applicants' recited invention is not obvious over the prior art. The recited invention goes beyond merely combining a prior art version of InTouch® with the ViewSonic tablet PC. A set of application programs relating to supervisory control of industrial processes *interact with a user via a set of tablet PC interface services*. This recited element of Applicants' presently claimed invention is not taught or suggested in the combined teachings of the ViewSonic tablet PC and the InTouch® HMI application.

Conclusion

Applicants respectfully submit that the patent application is in condition for allowance. If, in the opinion of the Examiner, a telephone conference would expedite the prosecution of the subject application, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned attorney.

Respectfully submitted,

Mark Joy, Reg. No. 35,562
LEYDIG, VOIT & MAYER, LTD.
Two Prudential Plaza, Suite 4900
180 North Stetson Avenue
Chicago, Illinois 60601-6731
(312) 616-5600 (telephone)
(312) 616-5700 (facsimile)

Date: April 11, 2007

224183ROA1